



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,392	07/30/2003	Prasanna Amitabh	CHA920030017US1	9419

45095 7590 03/18/2010
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14 FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/18/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/630,392	Applicant(s) AMITABH ET AL.	
	Examiner AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the **Appeal Brief** filed on **11/6/09**, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. **A new ground of rejection is** set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/JOHN W HAYES/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628

Status of Claims

2. Due to communications filed 11/6/09, the following is a non-final office action. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. Claims 1-26 are rejected as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 9, 18-20, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie (US 2009/0063246 A), and further in view of Chaddha et al (US 20060293942 A1).

As per claims 1,18, Lurie discloses:

a user interface that provides distributed access for customers and support providers to case information within the CRM system, wherein the customers and the support providers are separate and distinct institutions; and wherein the user interface provides access to a customer case management page for viewing all cases opened for a given customer and a case summary page for viewing details of individual cases stored within the CRM system; wherein a customer case includes a request from the customer to the support provider for support, ([0039], The system 100 also includes one

Art Unit: 3628

or more service providers 200 (200-A, . . . , 200-N) each having a communications device 202 (202-1, . . . , 202-N) that is connected to a communications network 110. Accordingly, one or more service seekers (users) 104 (104-1, . . . , 104-N) access the service provider system via either communications devices 104 (104-A, . . . , 104-N) that are connected to the communications network 110 or service seeker computers 120. In accordance with the teachings of the present invention, a user 102 can send a request 106 (106-A, . . . , 106-N) via the communications device 104 or service seeker computer 120, which is received by the service provider server computer 300, and [0043] shows as each communication occurs between service seekers and service providers, a transaction record is generated in the service seeker transaction database 350 in order to enable customer management procedures, as will be described in further detail below, to provide service providers with listings of each service seeker that has received an advice communication from the service provider. As such, service providers, or system administrators, may view their respective service seekers (customers) via listings provided by customer management procedures, also, see figs 3 and figs 4);

a case management system for managing customer cases, wherein the case management system includes a system for assigning cases to different tiers within a support provider hierarchy, ([0054] shows an online service provider selection procedures 324 for providing the service seeker 102 with an online interface for providing listing of fields of service available from the audio portal system 100, as well as receiving various descriptors for narrowing the search of service providers, including

Art Unit: 3628

acceptable price ranges, acceptable quality ratings, specific languages, as well as a service provider ID of a specific service provider when known by the service seeker 102, and also in [0055] shows that a user computer is connected to a selected service provider for real-time communication, thereby showing that the provider is connected to (assigned) a service seeker (case) based different types of tiers, for example, price, quality, etc; and also [0026] and FIG. 15, depicts a flowchart illustrating a method for providing a service provider with a listing alert for one or more service seekers designated as potential repeat customers within the customer management screen in accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the present invention); and

Lurie does not disclose a compliance tracking system that retrieves previously loaded customer compliance data from a database; wherein the compliance data consists of information related to whether a customer has met certain required pre-set goals set by the CRM system, compares the compliance data for each customer with predetermined levels to determine customer compliance and provides a compliance indicator on the customer case management page, however Chaddha et al discloses a method and apparatus for technology resource management where it is shown that any type of application may be hosted across the different environments within a client group's environmental set including customer relationship management (CRM) applications as shown in [0051]. Chaddha et al also discloses a compliance sub-module 364 for comparing the monitored users or processors on each of the servers 116, 154 managed by the TRM with the corresponding licenses and leases to determine which are compliant and which are out of compliance as shown in [0074], and further

Art Unit: 3628

discloses that wherein the asset manager further tags non-compliant assets with a warning indicia as shown in claim 5 of Chaddha et al. It therefore would be obvious to combine Lurie and Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose a compliance tracking system that retrieves previously loaded customer compliance data from a database; wherein the compliance data consists of information related to whether a customer has met certain required pre-set goals set by the CRM system, compares the compliance data for each customer with predetermined levels to determine customer compliance and provides a compliance indicator on the customer case management page with the motivation of incorporating compliance tracking in a customer relationship management environment of Chaddha et al into the apparatus and method for online advice Customer Relationship Management of Lurie.

As per claims 2, 19, Lurie discloses

wherein the case management system further includes a notification system for automatically generating emails when a new case is opened, ([0040], shows user is connected to selected service provider via communication device, and [0042], shows that the advice communication may be in the form of a live advice conversation, a recorded advice communication, as well as a written advice communication via, for example, electronic mail).

As per claims 3, 20, Lurie discloses

wherein the case management system further includes a system that allows support providers to check-in/check-out cases, ([0092], service provider is provided with a compose e-mail option 506, a block option 508 and assign to list option 510. In order to use the provided options, a service provider will select checkboxes, indicated at col. 522, by for example, mouse clicking on the various checkboxes corresponding to desired service seekers. Once selected, the service provider can click on an option. Once the option is selected by the service provider, the customer management procedures 334 will process the selected service providers according to the selected option).

As per claims 9, 26, Lurie does not disclose wherein the compliance tracking system includes a system for creating a new customer case when a predetermined compliance risk level occurs however, Chaddha et al discloses in the abstract that the asset manager: determines demand for new assets and allocates available assets to meet the demand; determines assets not in compliance with existing software licenses; determines which host servers have actual service level metrics which are not compliant with the target service level metrics; and determines availability of a patch or upgrade for selected software and instances of the selected software among the assets. It would have been obvious to combine Lurie and Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the compliance tracking system includes a system for creating a new customer case when a predetermined compliance risk level

Art Unit: 3628

occurs with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management system has the ability to attempt to keep the system within compliance parameter.

5. Claims 4-7, 10-15, 21, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie (US 2009/0063246 A), and further in view of Chaddha et al (US 20060293942 A1), and further in view of Mikurak (US 7,130,807).

As per claims 4, 5, 21, 22, neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al discloses wherein the case management system further includes a set of business rules that determines what level of case information is to be made available to customers and support providers/ wherein the case management system further includes a set of business rules that determines how cases are to be assigned and escalated among the different tiers of support providers, however, Mikurak, in col. 130, lines 46-52, shows content may be matched to particular users via configurable business rules. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Lurie, Chaddha et al and Mikurak to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the case management system further includes a set of business rules that determines what level of case information is to be made available to customers and support providers/ wherein the case management system further includes a set of business rules that determines how cases are to be assigned

Art Unit: 3628

and escalated among the different tiers of support providers with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management systems incorporates business rules to assist with the management process.

As per claims 6, 23, Lurie does not disclose wherein the compliance tracking system determines a compliance risk level for each customer, however, Chaddha et al discloses in [0080] that a determination is made as to which assets have SLM which do not conform to target values/ranges, i.e. which assets are non-compliant, and clients associated with the non-compliant assets are determined and a provisioning recommendation is generated for them in process 1610. A recommendation may include specifics as to asset, target SLM, actual SLM, as well as a recommendation for an asset and purchase price therefore to bring the non-compliant asset(s) into compliance, e.g. more storage space, wider bandwidth. It would have been obvious to combine Lurie with Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the compliance tracking system determines a compliance risk level for each customer with the motivation of showing that the extent of compliance can be determined in a customer relationship management system.

Neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al discloses business rules, however, Mikurak, in col. 130, lines 46-52, shows content may be matched to particular users via configurable business rules. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Lurie, Chaddha et al and Mikurak to disclose business rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose business rules with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management systems incorporates business rules to assist with the management process.

As per claims 7, 24, Lurie does not disclose wherein the compliance risk level is selected from the group consisting of: in compliance, in danger of becoming out of compliance, and out of compliance, however, Chaddha et al discloses in [0080] that a determination is made as to which assets have SLM which do not conform to target values/ranges, i.e. which assets are non-compliant, and clients associated with the non-compliant assets are determined and a provisioning recommendation is generated for them in process 1610. A recommendation may include specifics as to asset, target SLM, actual SLM, as well as a recommendation for an asset and purchase price therefore to bring the non-compliant asset(s) into compliance, e.g. more storage space, wider bandwidth. It would have been obvious to combine Lurie with Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the compliance risk level is selected from the group consisting of: in compliance, in danger of becoming out of compliance, and out of compliance with the motivation of showing that the extent of compliance can be determined in a customer relationship management system.

Neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al discloses business rules, however, Mikurak, in col. 130, lines 46-52, shows content may be matched to particular users via configurable business rules. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Lurie, Chaddha et al and Mikurak to disclose business rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose business rules with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management systems incorporates business rules to assist with the management process.

As per claim 10, this claim meets all claim limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and in addition, neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al disclose assigning the new case to a first tier support provider; determining if the first tier support provider can handle the new case; and escalating the new case to a second tier support provider if the first tier support provider cannot handle the case, however, Mikurak, in col. 34, lines 36-59, shows Each tier, or level, possesses an increasing level of skill, with tasks and responsibilities distributed accordingly. Such a structure is as follows: Tier 1-- typically has a broad set of technical skills and is the first level of support to the customer. Typically this group is responsible for resolving 60 70 percent of the opened problems. Tier 2--are technical experts and field support personnel who may specialize in specific areas. Typically this group is responsible for resolving 30 40 percent of the opened problems. Tier 3--are considered solution experts and often consist of hardware vendors, software vendors or custom application development/maintenance teams (in-depth skills needed to investigate and resolve difficult problems within their area of

Art Unit: 3628

expertise). They are the last resort for solving the most difficult problems. Typically this group is responsible for resolving 5 percent or fewer of the opened problems. It therefore would be obvious to combine Lurie, Chaddha et al and Mikurak to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose assigning the new case to a first tier support provider; determining if the first tier support provider can handle the new case; and escalating the new case to a second tier support provider if the first tier support provider cannot handle the case with the motivation of showing distributed responsibilities amongst service providers.

As per claim 11, Lurie discloses:

wherein the network node comprises a web portal, ([0038], inherent with web server, and also shows in [0046] and audio portal connected by way of communications network, which is shown to be the web).

As per claim 12, Lurie does not disclose wherein the compliance indicator determines if the customer is in compliance, at risk of becoming out of compliance, or out of compliance, however, Chaddha et al discloses in [0080] that a determination is made as to which assets have SLM which do not conform to target values/ranges, i.e. which assets are non-compliant, and clients associated with the non-compliant assets are determined and a provisioning recommendation is generated for them in process

Art Unit: 3628

1610. A recommendation may include specifics as to asset, target SLM, actual SLM, as well as a recommendation for an asset and purchase price therefore to bring the non-compliant asset(s) into compliance, e.g. more storage space, wider bandwidth. It would have been obvious to combine Lurie with Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the compliance indicator determines if the customer is in compliance, at risk of becoming out of compliance, or out of compliance with the motivation of showing that the extent of compliance can be determined in a customer relationship management system.

As per claim 13, Lurie discloses generating emails in [0040], shows user is connected to selected service provider via communication device, and [0042], shows that the advice communication may be in the form of a live advice conversation, a recorded advice communication, as well as a written advice communication via, for example, electronic mail).

Neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al disclose a set of business rules, however, Mikurak, in col. 130, lines 46-52, shows content may be matched to particular users via configurable business rules. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Lurie, Chaddha et al and Mikurak to disclose business rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose business rules with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management systems incorporates business rules to assist with the management process.

As per claim 14, Lurie discloses:

comprising the further step of having an assigned support provider check out the case from the CRM system, ([0054] shows an online service provider selection procedures 324 for providing the service seeker 102 with an online interface for providing listing of fields of service available from the audio portal system 100, as well as receiving various descriptors for narrowing the search of service providers, including acceptable price ranges, acceptable quality ratings, specific languages, as well as a service provider ID of a specific service provider when known by the service seeker 102, and also in [0055] shows that a user computer is connected to a selected service provider for real-time communication, thereby suggesting that the provider is connected to (assigned) a service seeker (case) based different types of tiers, for example, price, quality, etc; and also [0026] and FIG. 15, depicts a flowchart illustrating a method for providing a service provider with a listing alert for one or more service seekers designated as potential repeat customers within the customer management screen in accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the present invention).

As per claim 15, Lurie discloses:

Art Unit: 3628

wherein the step of opening a new case is performed by the customer at the network node, (Fig 1).

As per claim 16, Lurie does not disclose wherein the step of opening a new case is initiated automatically when the customer is out of compliance, however, Chaddha et al discloses in the abstract that the asset manager: determines demand for new assets and allocates available assets to meet the demand; determines assets not in compliance with existing software licenses; determines which host servers have actual service level metrics which are not compliant with the target service level metrics; and determines availability of a patch or upgrade for selected software and instances of the selected software among the assets. It would have been obvious to combine Lurie and Chaddha et al to disclose the above limitation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the step of opening a new case is initiated automatically when the customer is out of compliance with the motivation of showing that a customer relationship management system has the ability to attempt to keep the system within compliance parameter.

6. Claims 8, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie (US 2009/0063246 A), and further in view of Chaddha et al (US 20060293942 A1), and further in view of Mikurak (US 7,130,807), and further in view of Sultan (US 2009/0089125 A1).

As per claim 8, 17 and 25, neither Lurie nor Chaddha et al nor Mikurak disclose wherein the compliance indicator comprises a traffic light indicator having a green, yellow and red light. However, Sultan discloses a multi-user, multi-organization web-based system for processing customs information where [0103] shows that a customs department primary goal is to find imports that are non-compliant. In order to ensure **compliance**, the declaration and accompanying documentation are reviewed in step S802. The RMS Module scans through the declarations submitted for any risk, and determines the status of the declaration (e.g., RED, YELLOW or GREEN channel) in steps S804 and S806. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Lurie nor Chaddha et al, Mikurak and Sultan to disclose wherein the compliance indicator comprises a traffic light indicator having a green, yellow and red light.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein the compliance indicator comprises a traffic light indicator having a green, yellow and red light with the motivation of showing a visual indication of compliance.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

•Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.
March 16, 2010

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628